

A
DISCOURSE
OF
TOLERATION:

With some
OBSERVATIONS
UPON
The late Act
OF
PARLIAMENT.

Printed in the Year 1691.



145

262-8
card

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

3701 AVENUE

NEW YORK

1911

Advertisement.

IT will appear upon the perusal of the following Discourse, that the Author of it, attending only to what he conceived to be the Sense of the Act for Toleration, and not having recourse to the exact Words thereof, has a little mistaken that Statute. For he says, That all those are excluded from the benefit of this Toleration, who do not believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is believed and taught in the Church of England.

Now the Clauses in the Act concerning this matter, are in Page 309, and Page 317.

In the former, 'tis provided that Persons in Holy Orders, or pretending to Holy Orders, Preachers, or Teachers in Dissenting Congregations, shall be free from the Penalties of the Act for restraining Non-conformists from inhabiting in Corporations, and of the Act of Uniformity; Upon condition only of their taking the Oaths, and declaring their approbation of and subscribing to the Articles of Religion mentioned in a Statute made 13th Eliz. (viz. the 39 Articles,) except the 34th, 35th, and 36th, and some words of the 20th.

In the other Clause, 'tis enacted that the benefit of the Act shall not extend to any Person that shall deny, in his Preaching or Writing, the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid Articles of Religion.

So that none but publick Preachers, &c. are comprehended in these Restrictions. All that are not so, may believe what they please concerning the Trinity, without being excluded from the benefit of this Act. And so indeed may Preachers too: Only they must not teach publickly any thing contrary to those Articles, which they are to subscribe, and declare their Approbation (not Belief) of.

A learned Prelate of our Church, (Dr. Jer. Taylor,) in excuse for the many Divines of our Church, (who tho' they incline to the Arminian Opinions, touching Free Will and Predestination, yet subscribe to the 39 Articles, which manifestly favour the contrary Doctrine, viz. that of Calvin, which is embraced by most sorts of Dissenters) in some of his Writings, tells us, That those Articles were never designed as Declarations of Truths necessary to be believed ; but as Articles only of Peace ; which no Subscriber should oppose or preach against. And that this is not only the Sense of one Doctor, but indeed the general Sense of all the Church of England, especially in the matter of the Trinity, appears by her admitting us to both the Sacraments, without requiring any Declaration of our Belief in that point, so as it is explained in the Creed called Athanasius's, or in the 39 Articles.

Now just what those Articles are by this Doctor lookt upon to be, in respect to the Clergy of the Church of England ; such by this Act are they (and particularly the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it is explain'd in them) made to the Dissenting Ministers ; Articles, I mean of Peace, and no more.

Thus it appears indeed that the Act does not (as this Writer says) exclude all Persons from the benefit of this Toleration who believe not the Trinity, as 'tis taught in the Church of England. But nevertheless it must be confest that all his Reasonings hold good against the Act, upon account of the restraint it lies upon Ministers in their preaching.

For if in a speculative point, where all Parties pretend to have Scripture, Authority, and Reason on their side, the Teachers of all Persuasions are obliged to subscribe to the Decisions and Explications of one only Party, and not to teach or preach (tho' both themselves and their Congregations may believe) things contrary thereunto ; there seems still sufficient reason for this Writers Assertion, That this Act of Toleration is not comprehensive enough ; And that it not being built upon the true Principle, (viz. That Liberty of Conscience is a Natural Right, and that therefore Conscience ought not in any wise to be forced) its Foundation is too narrow to support it, and it cannot last long.

A Discourse of Toleration, &c.

THE Gospel was at first planted and propagated by mild and gentle Methods. Our Saviour did not send out his Disciples arm'd with Swords or Spears, or any other Instruments of War. Their Weapons were wholly Spiritual: Charity and Humility, Kindness and Condescension, were the Arms which the first Preachers of Christianity made use of to conquer the World, and bring it into Subjection to Christ. By these means was the Christian Religion spread over the World: And it overcame all Opposition, by the irresistible force of Truth only. And though the forward Zeal of after-Ages has prompted them to call in the Foreign assistance of Force and Power, yet Experience shows, That their Endeavours have very rarely been Crown'd with Success; which we need not wonder at, because it is very Natural that Religion should be preserv'd by the same means by which it was at first produc'd.

For my part, I am so far from envying the Dissenters the Liberty they now enjoy, or being angry with the Parliament for passing the late Act in their Favour, that I think they have done us of the Church of *England* a Kindness in it, as well as the Dissenters. Since now we no longer lie under any Obligation of troubling or disquieting our Neighbours for Matters of Religion. This Act cannot but calm all Minds that are truly dispos'd to Peace, and still those peevish Animosities which were occasion'd by the Mis-

carriages of some few weak, or passionate, or interested men, whose over-hasty Zeal carried them beyond the true Rules of Conduct. We all now know who it was set those weak men a-work, and made Tools of them, to do a business which they they never dream'd of. But now they have seen their Error, and repented. And we hope, that the good Nature of the Dissenters will not Father a persecuting Spirit upon our whole Church, by reason of the Mistakes of some few unthinking men in it.

But methinks I could have wish'd that the Act had been more Comprehensive. For I fear, that it being built upon too narrow a Foundation, it cannot last long: Since by this Act several Persons are still liable to the Lash of the Law, upon the account of their bare Opinion in matters of Religion. For upon the same grounds that these are excepted, succeeding Parliaments may think fit to except others whom they judge to hold Opinions equally false and dangerous, and so more and more by degrees, till at length the whole *Toleration* dwindles into nothing. For if it be once allow'd, That some persons may justly be punished for Mistakes in Judgment, in such things as have no relation to Civil Affairs, it will be very difficult to assign any good Reason why others should be wholly exempted from the Penalties of the Law, and not be punished for holding false Opinions, provided the Government shall at any time so think fit.

It seems a strange Paradox, that men should contend for Liberty of Conscience, as a Natural Right, and yet not be willing to allow all men this Privilege; as if Nature were so far a Step-Dame to some of her Children, as to deny them a Title to the Common Rights of Humanity.

I must confess, That ever since I came to consider things, I have been of Opinion, That *Conscience ought not to be forc'd*; and that no man was justly punishable for differing in his Judgment (in any Point whatever) from the Established Religion. For the Confirmation of which Opinion, I humbly propose these following Considerations.

1. It is not in our own power to believe as we please: If upon mistaken Grounds, I believe that to be true, which is really false; yet still I so believe, and cannot but believe, till I am convinc'd of my Error. But after a clear and full Conviction, I throw aside my former Opinion, and cannot possibly (though I would) believe it. For as *Plato* well observes, *Every Soul is unwillingly deprived of Truth*. And 'tis beyond the power of a Man to resist Truth, when it once plainly shews its self unto him.

Since therefore our Errors are not voluntary, we ought not to be punish'd for them. For what we cannot help, is at least excusable, if not justifiable. And all Error intrudes its self against a Man's Will; and therefore is not punishable. For 'tis unjust to punish where there is no Fault; and it is no Fault for a man not to do what it is impossible for him to do.

Nor doth Force make any Alteration in the Case. It may indeed make us dissemble, and play the Hypocrites, and cause us to profess that we believe what we really do not believe:

But it cannot change our Minds. For we shall still (so long as our Judgment is not convinc'd) retain the same Sentiments we had before. Therefore Men should be reason'd, and not forc'd into a right Faith.

2. Though an Erroneous Faith be supposed to be never so dangerous and destructive to the Soul that entertains it, yet it injures no body but him that has it. If my Neighbour embraces Heretical Opinions, the hurt is only to himself. It neither hinders my Salvation, nor is it any prejudice to my Temporal Affairs. Indeed, if false Opinions did any way violate the Rights of others, then there might be some Colour for prosecuting the Authors of them; even tho they could not help what they did, and so consequently were guilty of no Crime. For Self-preservation is an unalterable Law of Nature, which warrants every one to defend his own Right. Thus we commonly destroy Vermine, Birds and Beasts of Prey, because they injure us; though we know (at the same time) that they only act according to their Natures, and are not Criminal in so doing.

But here some may urge, That difference in Opinions gives birth to Faction and Sedition, and often ends in Rebellion; it fills all places with Disorder and Confusion, and is inconsistent with the Quiet and Happiness of Society.

Now if it could be prov'd, That such dismal Consequences would naturally and necessarily flow from a Toleration, then I confess, That every man that lov'd his Countrey, ought to oppose it. It would be a great happiness, if Mankind were united in one Faith, and we all thought and spake the same things: But this is a blessing rather to be wish'd than hoped for. Mens apprehensions of things being so various,

various, it is morally impossible, that we should not differ in Opinion:

But however, Force is not the best, nor only way of preserving Peace. For if men would but be prevail'd upon to lay aside prejudice and passion, and bear with one another; if they would be so rational, as not to suffer their Love and Kindness to be lessen'd by a difference in Opinion; if every one had Liberty to enjoy his own Opinion, and thought it his duty to permit others to do the like; we should never have any the least occasion to quarrel or contend about Religion. If this mild and peaceable Doctrine were once heartily embrac'd, and generally entertain'd, it would soon stifle all Heats and Animosities, and restore that Love and Chariry, which by the Gospel we are obliged to practice, even towards our Enemies and Persecutors, much more towards our Friends and Brethren, though in some Points their Opinions are different from ours. And then, though we were not united in Opinion, yet if we were in Love, that very Love would compose our differences, and settle a firm and undisturb'd Peace among us.

And that this is not a meer Notional *Chimera*, which has been entertained only by some few Bookish men, who were never versed in the World, and so understand little or nothing of the Temper and Inclinations of Mankind; but that it is a thing really practicable, is evident from the Experience of above 4000 years; during which time, the *Heathen World*, though divided into as many Opinions as we now are (and some of them about matters of the highest Consequence in Religion) did nevertheless enjoy a constant and uninterrupted Peace, being never troubled with any Wars, Feuds or Disturbances, upon the account of their differences in Religion.

If it be asserted, That later Ages have afforded Instances of a quite con-

trary Nature, and that our Disputes about Religion, have not only banish'd all Love and Kindness from among us, but have oftentimes involved us in Blood: I answer, That 'tis not the difference in Opinions, but the refusing to give Liberty to those who dissent from us, that has been the chief occasion of those Miseries and Calamities that have befallen us. Oppression unites the several Sects, and causes them to joyn as one, that they may regain their lost Liberty. This occasions a continual struggling betwixt them and the Establish'd Church. And from hence all the Wars and Bustles that have happen'd in the *Christian World*, upon the account of Religion, have had their Rise. If therefore a full and impartial Toleration were once settled, all occasion of difference would immediately cease; and the Dissenters having no just cause of Discontent, would be no longer dangerous Subjects. But if any prevailing Party, moved by Ambition, and encourag'd by the confidence of their great Numbers, should attempt any thing against the Government, 'tis probable that many sober and peaceable Men even of their own Party would oppose them; since they would now want the most plausible pretence of drawing them in. But, to be sure, Interest would oblige all other Dissenters to stand by the Government, and to guard and support it; because they know that under it they shall enjoy the freedom of their Religion, and that they need not fear the severity of the Laws, so long as they neither injure their Neighbours, nor offend against the Civil Peace. Hence it appears that it is the interest of Governors to indulge Dissenters, since that will make them to sit more safe and secure.

A Toleration likewise would very much conduce to the preservation of the establish'd Church. For this would cause the several Sects to watch and have

have an Eye upon one another. Every Party would fear another's being uppermost. Because if that should ever happen; they could not easily hope for so kind and charitable dealing, as they had formerly receiv'd from those they had dispossest, who had given them Liberty.

3. Tho' some Men pretend that it is out of Charity to their Souls, that they force Dissenters into the Church, lest by dying in an erroneous Opinion they should perish eternally, yet is this pretence vain and groundless. For we all know that it is not the making profession of the true Religion, nor the outward Conformity to its worship, that will save us. 'Tis the Mind that God chiefly regards; and what ever we do, if we do it not in the sincerity of our Heart, it is no thing worth.

4. Truth oftentimes lies so much in the dark, that it is very difficult to find it out; And Error carries oftentimes along with it such a fair appearance of Truth, that it doth not only impose upon the weak and careless, but does also sometimes deceive the wise and diligent Enquirer. Since then there is so great hazard of our being betrayed into Errors, (and that upon probable grounds,) methinks good nature should incline us to make poor mistaken Souls, objects of our pity rather than anger.

Besides, since no Person is ever the more infallible for being invested in the Supreme Power, it is not impossible but that the Rulers and Magistrates themselves (not being able to see through the thick Mists wherewith Truth is veiled) may instead of their supposed *Juno* embrace a Cloud; And the seeming Truth they so earnestly contend for, may possibly be Error hid under a fair disguise. This, methinks, should cause Magistrates to be very cautious how they punish Men for their opinion in Religion; lest

while they fancy themselves to be rooting out Error, they should indeed oppose the Truth. This we know was St Paul's own Case, who out of his great zeal to the glory of God persecuted the true Religion, and cruelly murdered the best and most faithful of the Servants of God. And if we examine the Opinions of the present Rulers of the World, we shall find amongst them more Patrons of Error, than Defenders of the true Faith; which may convince us of the Reasonableness of our Saviours Rule, viz. To let the Tares grow until the Harvest, lest we root up also the Wheat with them.

Lastly. We are not only by Scripture enjoined to try all things, but our Church likewise encourages us to examine things our selves, and to make use of our own judgments in the choice of our Religion. Now it seems a little hard to put us upon searching and judging for our selves, and yet to force us to comply with the former determinations of other Men. This were to punish us for following that Rule, which she herself hath recommended to us.

Having thus laid down some of those Reasons which induced me to adhere to the Opinion above-mentioned, I shall proceed to the Exceptions in the Act; and consider what there is in the Opinions, there mentioned, that renders those that hold them unfit to be tolerated. And,

1. All those are excluded from the benefit of this Toleration who do not believe the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as it is believed and taught in the Church of England. Concerning which, I observe that this Doctrine has no relation at all to Civil Affairs. And therefore all who are punished for their mistakes in this point, are punish'd for their bare Opinion only in Religion: and for an Opinion which is not in the least prejudicial to the State; And

And therefore they may properly be said to suffer for Conscience sake.

It cannot be proved that that Arch-Heretic *Socinus* himself, or any of his followers, ever endanger'd the publick Peace, or were worse Subjects than other men. And consequently they may as safely be permitted to enjoy the freedom of their Religion as any other Dissenters whatsoever.

Besides, if we seriously consider this Doctrine, we shall find it clog'd with so many and so great difficulties, that an honest and sincere Soul may easily be mistaken. If we examine the Scripture proofs, we shall find no clear and express Declaration, that there is a *Trinity* of Persons in one and the same Divine Essence, in all that Sacred Volume: but that it is proved by Consequences and Deductions, and those oftentimes so far fetch'd, that they may possibly be overseen by a diligent searcher. And on the other hand, *John* 14. 28. and some other places, seem so favourable to the *Socinian* Hypothesis, that if there were no other places of Scripture relating to those points besides those, we should be apt to interpret them in the same sense as our Adversaries do. And tho' in this Controversie we multiply Scripture quotations, yet so many of them are by the most learned Men of our own side, confessed to be unconcluding, that perhaps some may from thence be encouraged to suspect the rest.

If from Scripture we pass to Reason, that rather discourages, than any ways supports or defends the Orthodox Opinion. The Arguments which are urg'd from thence are confessed to be such as we can give no clear solution to. And it is no wonder that our weak understandings are puzzled in the Contemplation of so sublime a Mystery. Nor is it any disparagement to our Cause that we refuse to make Reason a Judge in a Case she has so very little knowledge of. 'Tis not a sufficient Argument to

overthrow our Doctrine, that we cannot solve all the difficulties that are started about a matter which is of so high a nature, that it is above humane understanding. We confess it to be too great for us to fathom. For it would be rashness and inadvertency, if not madness, for a finite Being to propose to it self the Comprehension of Infinity. But as for the *Socijans*, (who believe the Objections to be utterly unanswerable, and think that it may be proved that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* implies a Contradiction.) They lie under a strong temptation of being of an Opinion contrary to us, and to interpret such places of Scripture as relate to this Doctrine in a different sense from what we usually give of them. For it is a Maxim generally allowed by Protestants, that what can be clearly proved to be contrary to Reason is impossible to be true; and therefore ought upon no account whatever to be received. And tho' we know that no such thing can be proved of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, yet there are such seeming appearances, as may probably misguide an honest and well-meaning Man.

If we are willing to be guided by the Authority of the Fathers, we shall find that those who are most ancient, and lived in the first Ages of Christianity, are claim'd both by the *Socinians* and us, and both sides equally pretend to quote them as Favourers of the Opinion which each Party holds. And the truth is, they have deliver'd themselves in such ambiguous and obscure Terms about this question, that 'tis a hard matter to unravel what their true Sentiments were concerning it. For they (as St. *Jerom* observes, *4. pol. 2. Adv. Russ. p. 223.*) before the *Southern Devil Arim* arose at *Alexandria*, innocenter quædam, & minus curè locuti sunt. And therefore a very learned Man, who is at present in an eminent station in our Church, might upon

good grounds justify what he has declared in private; that this is the hardest Controversie we have to manage.

The Consideration of which should, methinks, be sufficient to bespeak the Candor of all charitable persons, in the behalf of those unfortunate Souls, who are unwillingly involv'd in this Error, since they have such difficulties to encounter with, as are almost insuperable.

Such Thoughts as these might prevail with *Salvian* to entertain so favourable an Opinion of the *Arrians*, that though he sufficiently dislike'd their Heresie, yet because they firmly believ'd themselves to be in the right, he refused to condemn them; and conceived more hopes of such mens Salvation, than of the most *Orthodoxe Christians*, who lead ill Lives; and he gives his Opinion of them in these mild Terms, *How they shall be punished for it, in the Day of Judgment, none can know but the Judge.* Nay, a very Learned Man of our Church, (*Dr. Crakemborg*) goes further, and excuses all such from Heresie, who profess *Arrianism* in the simplicity and sincerity of their hearts, and are willing to forsake it, upon manifestation that the Scriptures teach the contrary; and he compares their Case to *St. Cyprian's* professing *Re-baptization*, and *Irenaeus* the *Milenary Heresie*, p. 109. *Vigilius dormitans.*

Dr. Hammond urges this Principle higher still; for thus he argues: *Sure he that makes right Reason the Judge of his very Principles, must needs be so rational and ingenious, that he can never be an Heretick, though he say the very things that Hereticks do.* (Infallibility of the Church of Rome, p. 51.)

If it be objected to the *Socinians*, That they are *Atheists*, and deny the True God; and *Idolaters*, in worshipping a Creature instead of God, I reply:

The Charge of *Atheism* is so ill-grounded and extravagant, that it needs no Answer. For how is it possible, that they should deny the True God, who

own the same God that the Scriptures declare unto us, and whom all *Christians* adore? The difference between the *Socinian* and the *Orthodox*, is not about, which is the True God (for they both worship the same), but about the Manner of his Subsistence, *whether this God doth subsist in but One Person, or in Three?* Now if every Mistake about the Nature of God, be a Denial of him, I fear there are but few who confess the True God. But if not, then we may allow the *Socinians* to hold the True God, seeing they acknowledge him to be God, who is *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; tho they differ about the Mode of his Being, and deny that he is *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*

If it be urg'd, That this is no slight and trivial Error, but of pernicious consequence, highly derogating from the Honour of the Second and Third Person; I answer, That several other Dissenters profess Opinions as blasphemous as this, and as dishonourable to the whole Godhead, as this is to the Two Last Persons; and yet these are tolerated. As for Instance; The Doctrine of *Absolute Reprobation*, is utterly inconsistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of God. Now certainly they who rob the Deity of these Two Glorious Attributes, make a more disadvantageous Representation of him to Mankind, than either the *Arrians* or *Socinians* do. If it be alledged in behalf of these Persons, That it was their great Zeal for the Glory of God, and their desire to extol his Power, as absolute Sovereign of Mankind, that first drew them into this Error; Why then may not those who deny the Trinity, make use of the like plea? For 'tis well known, that this Heresie first sprang from the great Antipathy which some men bore to the *Heathen Idolatry*, who for fear they should admit of a Rival into God's Throne, as a Partner with him in his Divine Empire, unhappily denied the Trinity.

To the charge of Idolatry I shall oppose nothing: (for I do not pretend to be the *Socinians* Advocate.) But if from thence it be infer'd, That they ought not to be Tolerated, I deny the Consequence. For if we once grant, That the Magistrate may force men from a false Religion, by the Penalties of the Law, we shall never know where to stop; because the same Reasons which justify the rooting out of Idolatry, will soon be made use of for the suppressing all such Errors as shall be judged hurtful and dangerous to mens Souls, till at length all men shall be forc'd to conform to that Rule of Faith which the Supreme Magistrate esteems to be the only true one.

Besides, That power which we allow the Supream Magistrate to pull down and destroy an Idolatrous Church, may in another time and place be made use of to the subversion of the true one. As for Example, in the Case before us: We are as much Idolaters in the Opinion of the *Socinians*, as they are in ours; and consequently where the power is in their hands, they will be as much obliged to destroy us, as we are bound, now the Magistrate is on our side, to root out them. For every one supposes himself to be in the right. So that instead of the Legacy of Peace which our Saviour left to his Disciples, if we give way to these persecuting Principles, we shall entail upon the World a perpetual War. And those barbarous and inhumane Tortures, for the Exercise of which we have a just Aversion to the *French King*, will in time gain a general approbation, and be universally practis'd.

But suppose, for Argument's sake, that these Hereticks, upon the account of the greatness of their Error deserve to be excluded from all Favour, yet is the Exception in the Act too large; since it thurs some from the benefit of the Act, whom it expressly names, as persons fit to be Tolerated, viz. the *Quakers*.

For it appears from their Writings, as well as private Discourses, That many, if not most of them, are Heterodox, as to this Point of the Trinity, and consequently cannot, with a safe Conscience, subscribe the Test required of them; which perhaps may cause some of them to look upon this Act as a Mockery of them; and an Abuse; since (though all the Acts against them are actually repeal'd, yet) if they should be Indicted upon any of these Statutes, they have no right to this Plea, unless they first subscribe a Declaration, which they in their Consciences judge to be false.

The Followers of *Origen* are likewise uncapable of receiving any benefit from this Act. For though *Origen* held every One of the Three *Hypotheses* to be truly and properly God, yet his Opinion is something different from what is at present profess'd by the Church of *England*. Now if any one who delighted in the Writings of this Pious and Judicious Father, should by degrees be drawn in, to approve of the *Origenian Hypothesis* concerning this Point, surely so small an Error in such a nice question would not render him unworthy of that Kindness which we willingly bestow on those who openly maintain Tenents of a far more mischievous Nature.

I might likewise instance in such as adhere to the Opinions of the *Eastern Church*, since our Divines are generally very favourable to these. Dr. *Stillingfleet* (now Bishop of *Worcester*) in his Vindication of his Answer to the King's Papers, pleads in their behalf, p. 23. Is it not (says he) a very hard case, these should be excluded the *Catholic Church*, and consequently from Salvation, for not rightly understanding the subtilties of the distinction betwixt Nature and Person; or whether Subsistence can be separated from individual Nature; or whether an Hypostatical Union doth imply that the individual Nature doth lose its own Subsistence. I appeal to the Conscience of any good *Christian*,

Now if any of this Commission is
 would urge this Amendment for a
 I cannot think it would lose
 such as its freedom

add to this, that it looks a little like
 a Lie, when we have given so general
 a Liberty, to tie Men up so strictly
 in the most nice and difficult point;
 concerning which Dr *Falvey* owns that
 the *Armenian Creed* gives some explica-
 tions, which are not so necessary to be un-
 derstood and believed by the meanest Ch-
 ristians. Lib. Ecc. c. 4. §. 4. P. 146.

Moreover, by this Act most of the Dissenters are obliged to subscribe to they know not what. For to understand thoroughly the Doctrine of our Church in this point, they must be versed not only in our Articles, Common-Prayer Book, and Book of Homilies, but even in the first four General Councils; since we profess to believe what ever they have determin'd. And I believe there are but few (even of their Teachers) will pretend to be mightily acquainted with them.

As for the Papists, though they are not included in this Toleration, yet I cannot plead so much on their behalf, because both their Doctrines and Practices are prejudicial to the publick Peace. However, I cannot but wish

The Pope has power to depose heretical Kings or that Power is due to the King with Heretics.) These were points of their believing Transubstantiation; which was a new Religion doctrine, and the believing of which one way or the other makes an Man's private Right, nor any ways affects the publick Peace.

But if we must have something a-
bout this said Doctrine, let it be this:
That every Person who is tolerated
shall declare that no one ought to be
punished for holding either side of the
question. And I verily believe if the
Papists were secure of enjoying the
freedom of their Religion here, dis-
claiming only such Doctrines as are in-
consistent with the Government, they
would not be so violently bent on King
James's Interest, as to bring the eter-
nal ruin of themselves and Families
for his sake.

I pray God to encline our Minds to mild and moderate Councils. For as the Bishop of Rochester says in the conclusion of his second Letter to the Lord Dorset, ——— *To calm Mens Minds for the future, to settle Affairs in a secure and lasting Peace, most certainly a gentle, generous, charitable Temper is the best.*

FINIS.